




# A Sheaf-Theoretic Characterization of Tasks in Distributed Systems

Stephan Felber ✉ 

TU Wien, Vienna, Austria

Bernardo Hummes Flores ✉ 

École Polytechnique, Palaiseau, France

Hugo Rincon Galeana ✉ 

TU Berlin, Berlin, Germany

---

## Abstract

Task solvability lies at the heart of distributed computing, with direct implications for both theoretical understanding and practical system design. The field has evolved multiple theoretical frameworks for this purpose, including topological approaches, epistemic logic, and adversarial models, but these often address specific problem classes, limiting cross-domain applications. Our approach provides a unifying mathematical perspective across message-passing system models. We introduce a unifying sheaf-theoretic perspective that represents task solvability across message-passing system models while maintaining clear connections to the underlying distributed computing principles.

A fundamental challenge in distributed computing is constructing global solutions from local computations and information. Sheaf theory addresses this challenge by providing a mathematical framework for assessing globally consistent properties from locally defined data, offering a natural language to describe and reason about distributed tasks. Sheaves have proven valuable in studying similar local-to-global phenomena, from opinion dynamics to contextuality in quantum mechanics and sensor integration. We now extend this framework to distributed systems.

In this paper, we introduce a sheaf-theoretic characterization of task solvability in any model with a message based adversary. We provide a novel construction of a task sheaf, and prove that non-trivial sections correspond to valid solutions of a task, while obstructions to global sections represent system limitations that make tasks unsolvable. Furthermore, we also show that the cohomology of a task sheaf may be used to compute solving protocols. This opens space for new connections between distributed computing and sheaf theory for both protocol design and impossibility analysis.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation → Distributed computing models; Mathematics of computing

**Keywords and phrases** Task Solvability, Locality, Distributed computing, Sheaf Theory, Kripke Frame, Applied Category Theory, Cohomology Theory

## 1 Introduction

A central problem in computer science, and distributed computing in particular, is determining whether or not a specific problem can be solved. To this end, a plethora of models and frameworks have been developed in order to determine solvability. Among many others, Turing machines and lambda calculus are worthy to be mentioned.

In the context of distributed computing, perhaps one of the earliest results overall, is the two generals problem impossibility, due to Akkoyunlu, Ekkanadham and Huber [2], which roughly states that consensus is impossible in networks with message loss and unbounded delays. Numerous solvability and impossibility results, in particular with respect to consensus and agreement variations, have followed since. For instance, the celebrated FLP (for Fischer, Lynch and Patterson) [11] impossibility result, that shows consensus impossibility in asynchronous and crash-prone systems, the lossy-link impossibility result, due to Santoro and Widmayer [29], which shows that consensus is impossible even in a synchronous two-process

model, Halpern and Moses’s characterization of consensus in distributed systems via epistemic logic [15], and Nowak, Schmid and Winkler’s topological characterization of consensus under general message adversaries [26].

Although the aforementioned results are mostly related to problem solvability, they are specifically focused on consensus. Nevertheless, these results undoubtedly contributed to the development of frameworks that would later address general task solvability. Some such noteworthy results are Herlihy and Shavit’s characterization of wait-free  $t$ -resilient shared memory distributed computation, via combinatorial topology [18], Attiya, Nowak and Castañeda’s characterization of terminating tasks [4], and Alcántara, Castañeda, Flores and Rajsbaum’s characterization of look-compute-move wait-free robot tasks [3].

Sheaf theory originated from studying how local constraints give rise to global solutions, paired with cohomology theory as a measure of obstructions to such global constructions. These same principles guide our approach here. Cellular sheaves were introduced by Curry [8] as a combinatorial counterpart to the common notion of sheaves found in the literature [22], with the interest of having a theory that is computable. Most importantly to us, the theory of cellular sheaves presents the concept of sheaves in an approachable manner, whence it becomes clear its usefulness to depict global properties of local information, as is the case for distributed computing.

There has been a recent growth in the effort towards applications of sheaf theory, with instances in sensor data integration [28, 19, 25], contextuality in quantum mechanics [1], modal logics [21, 20] and machine learning [5, 7]. Distributed applications have been considered before to describe concurrent systems [13, 24], but with a considerably limited scope in applicability. Most remarkably, Hansen and Ghrist [16] started the study of a Laplacian operator defined on vector space valued cellular sheaves, which was later applied with a control theoretic flavor to opinion dynamics[27] and extended for lattice valued data [12].

In this paper, we introduce a generic sheaf-theoretic approach on indistinguishability graphs<sup>1</sup>, that fully characterizes task solvability. Furthermore, our framework enables us to leverage the computational methods in cohomology theory so to analyze task solvability, and even derive solving algorithms in systems where the indistinguishability graph admits a cohomology group construction.

## 1.1 Paper Organization

In Section 2, we introduce the generic message passing system model that serves as the foundation for our sheaf-theoretic analysis in later sections. Beyond the distributed system model, we define two essential structures: the execution graph, which captures system causality, and the indistinguishability graph, which represents each process’s knowledge state. We complete the model with definitions of distributed tasks and their terminating solutions.

In Section 4, we present the sheaf task construction, explicitly stated in Definition 21, which captures the relation of the system model with a task specification. This allows us to state the main result, namely Theorem 30, matching terminating task solvability with the existence of sections on the task sheaf. A section, in this context, represents a globally consistent assignment of data to each cell that respects the restriction maps, effectively capturing a valid solution to the distributed task.

In Section 6, we extend our results beyond task solvability to derive solving protocols via

---

<sup>1</sup> These indistinguishability graphs are closely related to Kripke frames in epistemic logic see [9] for a detailed treatment on epistemic logic.

the cohomology of the task sheaf. We illustrate this method through simple examples that demons/trate protocol construction using sheaf cohomology.

## 2 System Model

We now introduce a general message passing model that will be later used in Section 4 to showcase how the perspective of sheaves naturally emerges from a distributed system. This model formalizes how processes communicate via point-to-point links and make decisions based on their local states. The states progress is modeled via a state-machine as is common in the literature.

► **Definition 1** (Message Passing Model). *A **message passing model** consists of:*

- *A set of finite processes  $\Pi = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  for simplicity indexed by natural numbers  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ .*
- *For each process  $p_i \in \Pi$ , a **local protocol**  $\mathcal{P}_{p_i} := \langle S_{p_i}, I_{p_i}, O_{p_i}, \mathcal{L}, \tau_{p_i}, \kappa_{p_i}, \delta_{p_i} \rangle$  where:*
  - *$S_{p_i}$  is the set of possible states,*
  - *$I_{p_i} \subseteq S_{p_i}$  is the set of possible input states,*
  - *$O_{p_i} \subseteq S_{p_i}$  is the set of possible output states,*
  - *$\mathcal{L}$  is the set of messages, with  $\perp \in \mathcal{L}$  representing the empty message,*
  - *$\tau_{p_i} : S_{p_i} \times \mathcal{L}^n \rightarrow S_{p_i}$  is a transition function,*
  - *$\kappa_{p_i} : S_{p_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^n$  is a communication function,*
  - *$\delta_{p_i} : S_{p_i} \rightarrow O_{p_i} \cup \{\perp\}$  is a decision function, where  $\perp$  represents that no decision could be made.*

The transition function  $\tau_{p_i}$  captures the state evolution of process  $p_i$ , while the communication function  $\kappa_{p_i}$  describes which messages are sent from  $p_i$  at a given state  $s \in S_{p_i}$ . We define an **inbox** as an  $n$ -tuple  $(w_1, \dots, w_n) \in \mathcal{L}^n$ . A **global protocol** is an  $n$ -tuple of local protocols  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathcal{P}_{p_i}\}_{i \in \Pi}$ , and due to its prevalence, will be referred to as simply *protocol*. Throughout the remainder of the paper, we will assume that all processes operate under identical local protocols. We further assume that all protocols are full information, defined as follows.

► **Definition 2** (Full Information Protocol). *A **full information protocol** sends in every step all information it has available, i.e.,  $\kappa_{p_i}(s) = s$ , and stores everything it has received, i.e.,  $\tau_{p_i}(s, \{m_j, \dots, m_k\}) = (s, (m_j, \dots, m_k))$ .*

The full information protocol goes back to [6], we introduce it here because of its illustrative traits leveraged in the examples. It is frequently used when searching for impossibility proofs, as anything that is impossible under a full information protocol is also impossible for any other protocol [10].

A **configuration**  $\langle g \rangle$  is a tuple of local states, one per process. A projection function  $\pi_{p_i} : S^n \rightarrow S_{p_i}$  is defined as mapping configurations to local states. A projection to the inputs  $\pi_I : S^n \rightarrow I^n$  is defined as retrieving the vector of input states, and accordingly they can be composed  $\pi_{I_i} = \pi_{p_i} \circ \pi_I : S^n \rightarrow I_{p_i}$ , projecting to  $p_j$ 's input. A configuration is called **terminal** if all processes' decision functions map to a valid output value. If this is true for some processes, but not all, then the configuration is called **partially terminated**. A protocol that always eventually provides a terminal configuration is called **terminating**. Additionally, we assume that the input values of a process are encoded into their local states and are not forgotten by the protocol.

The execution of a global protocol depends on the initial states that are provided to each process' state machine and on what messages are sent and received. The exchange of messages is subject to an adversarial influence, and is modeled via a communication adversary.

► **Definition 3** (Communication Adversary). A **communication adversary**  $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M}_t^1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_t^n)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of  $n$ -tuples of inboxes.  $\mathcal{M}_t^j$  represents an inbox received by  $p_j$ , at logical step  $t$ . Likewise,  $\mathcal{M}_t^{j \leftarrow k}$  represents the message received by  $p_j$  from  $p_k$  at step  $t$ .  $\mathcal{M}_t^{j \leftarrow k}$  is possibly empty, represented as  $\perp$ .

By controlling which messages arrive when, we can represent any adversarial influence manifested in message loss and delivery delays, ranging from lock-step synchronous models, to completely asynchronous distributed systems with no crashes.

► **Definition 4** (Lossy-Link Communication adversary). The **lossy-link** is a synchronous message passing adversary defined for two processes  $\Pi = \{a, b\}$ , where in each step only one of the two messages may be lost. We say a communication adversary  $\mathcal{M}_r$  is lossy-link iff it satisfies the following condition for all  $r$ :

$$(\mathcal{M}_r^{a \leftarrow b} = \perp \implies \mathcal{M}_r^{b \leftarrow a} \neq \perp) \vee (\mathcal{M}_r^{b \leftarrow a} = \perp \implies \mathcal{M}_r^{a \leftarrow b} \neq \perp).$$

► **Definition 5** (Run). Let  $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_p)_{p \in \Pi}$  be a protocol,  $(\langle g \rangle_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  a sequence of configurations, and  $(\mathcal{M}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  a communication adversary. We say that  $\sigma = (\langle g \rangle_t, \mathcal{M}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a **run of  $\mathcal{P}$**  iff it satisfies the following conditions:

- **Initialization:** The initial configuration corresponds to a valid task input  $\pi_I(\langle g \rangle_0) \in I_p$ ,
- **Causal consistency:** For every configuration  $\langle g \rangle_t$ , there is a non-empty set of processes  $A \subseteq \Pi$  such that

$$\pi_{p_j}(\langle g \rangle_{t+1}) = \begin{cases} \tau_{p_j}(\pi_{p_j}(\langle g \rangle_t), \mathcal{M}_t^i) & \text{if } p_j \in A \\ \pi_{p_j}(\langle g \rangle_t) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- **Communication consistency:** For every step  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , for any  $p_j, p_k \in \Pi$ , either  $\mathcal{M}_t^{j \leftarrow k} = \perp$  or there exists  $t' < t$  such that  $\kappa_{p_k}(\pi_{p_k}(\langle g \rangle_{t'})) = \mathcal{M}_t^{j \leftarrow k}$ .

The *causal consistency* condition states that at each step of the run, there is a non-empty set of active processes that makes progress by transitioning into a next local state, denoted by  $A$ . The *communication consistency* condition states that if a process  $p_j$  receives a non-empty message from a process  $p_k$ , at a step  $t$ , then there must exist a previous step  $t'$  where  $p_k$  sent the message to process  $p_j$ . A byproduct of our separation into protocol and decision function is that processes keep communicating even after the decision function has terminated by mapping to an output. This corresponds to the notion of *cooperative termination* where processes stay active and keep relaying messages after termination in order to assist everybody finishing.

We can now define execution graphs that do not depend on the system's decision functions.

► **Definition 6** (Execution Graph). Let  $\Sigma$  be a set of runs of a global protocol  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfying cooperative termination. The **execution graph** of  $\Sigma$  is a directed graph  $\mathcal{E}_\Sigma = (V(\mathcal{E}_\Sigma), E(\mathcal{E}_\Sigma))$  where:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathcal{E}_\Sigma) &:= \{\langle g \rangle \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma, \exists i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \sigma_i = (\langle g \rangle, \_)\}, \\ E(\mathcal{E}_\Sigma) &:= \{(\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma, \exists i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \sigma_i = (\langle g \rangle, \_), \sigma_{i+1} = (\langle h \rangle, \_)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P},I,\mathcal{M}}$  the uniquely generated execution graph generated by a protocol and communication adversary from the initial configurations  $I$ . When the protocol and adversary are clear from context, we simply write  $\mathcal{E}_I$ .

Provided the a message passing model and a message adversary, we can now talk about the distributed tasks for which we will provide a sheaf-theoretic perspective.

► **Definition 7 (Tasks).** A *task* is a triple  $T = \langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{I}$  is the set of possible input vectors,  $\mathcal{O}$  is the set of possible output vectors and  $\Delta : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{O}}$  is a map associating to each input vector the set of valid output vectors.  $\mathcal{I}_p, \mathcal{O}_p$  denote the possible inputs and outputs restricted to a process  $p$ .

► **Definition 8 (Terminating Task Solvability).** A protocol  $\mathcal{P}$  under a communication adversary  $\mathcal{M}$  is said to *solve* a task  $T$  if for every initial configuration  $\langle g \rangle_0 \in \mathcal{I}$  and every run  $\sigma = (\langle g \rangle_t, \mathcal{M}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  starting from  $\langle g \rangle_0$ , the following holds:

- **Termination:** For every process  $p_j \in Pi$ , there is a step  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\delta(\pi_j(\langle g \rangle_t)) \neq \perp$ ,
- **Validity:** There is an output vector  $o \in \Delta(\pi_I(\langle g \rangle_0))$ , such that for every process  $p_j \in Pi$  there is a step  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  where  $\delta(\pi_j(\langle g \rangle_t)) = o_p$  and for every  $t' \leq t$ ,  $\delta(\pi_j(\langle g \rangle_{t'})) = \perp$ .

Protocol  $\mathcal{P}$  is said to be a *solving protocol*.

*Termination* requires every process to eventually decide on some value, and *validity* requires that all individual decisions correspond to a valid output configuration for the respective input configuration. Note that the decision of process  $p$  corresponds to the first value obtained by its decision function other than  $\perp$ .

► **Definition 9 (Decision Function Termination).** A decision function terminates in an execution graph  $\mathcal{E}$  with respect to a task  $T$  iff any run in  $\mathcal{E}$  satisfies Definition 8.

### 3 System frames

From the system model established in Section 2, we formalize the requirement that the decision function of a solving protocol must be deterministic. This takes the form of a system frame, where any set of configurations that constitute a run are equipped with process-wise indistinguishability relations. The system frame will parametrize where, in the space of configurations, a decision function must behave constantly for lack of distinguishing power by the process.

► **Definition 10 (Configuration Indistinguishability).** Two configurations  $\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle$  are *indistinguishable* for process  $p_i$ , denoted by  $\langle g \rangle \sim_{p_i} \langle h \rangle$ , iff  $p_i$  has the same local state in both  $\langle g \rangle$  and  $\langle h \rangle$ , namely,  $\pi_{p_i}(\langle g \rangle) = \pi_{p_i}(\langle h \rangle)$ .

Recall that an execution graph can be uniquely generated for a given protocol  $\mathcal{P}$ , communication adversary  $\mathcal{M}$  and set of initial configurations  $I$ , denoted  $\mathcal{E}_I$ .

Edges on the execution graph are also called **causal links**, as they arrange the configurations in a causal sequences that follows the execution of a possible run. An acyclic execution graph also induces a partial order  $\leq$  over configurations, we write  $\langle g \rangle \leq \langle h \rangle$  if there exists a path from  $\langle g \rangle$  to  $\langle h \rangle$ . Note that any full information protocol therefore induces a partial order. The full-information protocol builds the finest execution graph, meaning with the least possible indistinguishabilities and no cycles. Any other protocol transmits less-than the full-information protocol results and in a *smaller* execution graph, possibly with cycles.

We define now the system frame, which formalizes the information available to each process throughout the possible executions of the distributed system. This structure will be

later used in Definition 21, on the construction of the task sheaf, to make precise the idea that a process must always choose the same value when the information available to it is the same.


► **Definition 11 (System Frame).** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a set of configurations and  $\{\sim_{p_i}\}_{i \in \Pi}$  the set of indistinguishability relations induced by  $\mathcal{C}^2$ . A **system frame** is the tuple  $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{C}, \{\sim_p\}_{p \in \Pi})$ .*

► **Remark 12 (System Frame are Induced by Configurations).** We say that a system frame  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is induced by  $\mathcal{C}$ . The maximal system frame is obtained by taking all configurations from an execution, i.e.,  $\mathcal{C} = V(\mathcal{E})$ , and is denoted  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{E}}$ .

► **Remark 13 (Equivalence Relation on the System Frame).** Note the indistinguishability relation on local states defines an equivalence relation.

See in Example 14 for the explicit construction of a system frame after one step.

► **Example 14.** A system frame after one step corresponding in the lossy-link synchronous message adversary (Definition 4) under a full-information protocol (Definition 2) is shown in Figure 1. This is the finest execution graph possible under the lossy-link adversary. Dotted arrows are the causal links,  $(0,0)$  represents the inputs for each process: 0 for  $a$  and 0 for  $b$ , the arrows  $\leftarrow, \leftrightarrow, \rightarrow$  represent the messages delivered where  $a \leftarrow b$  means  $a$  received  $b$ 's message. The colored edges denote the indistinguishability edges between configurations, orange for  $a$ , green for  $b$ . The nodes here represent the configurations: for example, after the first step,  $a$  cannot distinguish between  $(0,0 \rightarrow)$  from  $(0,1 \rightarrow)$  as  $a$  hasn't received a message in neither configuration, whereas  $b$  can distinguish the two configurations because it has a different inputs in them.



■ **Figure 1** Depiction of the system frame up to step 1 of the lossy-link synchronous message adversary together with a full-information protocol. This system frame grows to the right.

An example for the causality relation would be the configuration  $(0,0 \leftrightarrow)$  depending on the configuration  $(0,0)$ , written as  $(0,0) \leq (0,0 \leftrightarrow)$ .

<sup>2</sup> Obtained by applying Definition 10

## 4 Tasks and Task Sheaves

In this section, we introduce cellular sheaves as a mathematical framework for modeling distributed tasks. Sheaves provide a formalism that captures both the global structure of a task definition and the local constraints under which protocols must operate.

Now, we will briefly introduce cellular sheaves<sup>3</sup> and precise how both the concepts of system frames and tasks can be unified as a cellular sheaf. We will further demonstrate that asking if a given task, under a communication adversary, has solutions, is equivalent to assessing if the respective task sheaf has global sections, an analog to constraint satisfaction.

Sheaves can be informally understood as a structure allowing to track data that is associated to pieces of a space. A key characteristic of *cellular* sheaves is the combinatorial nature of this space, which allows us to look at discrete structures and their generalizations to higher dimensions, such as graphs and cellular complexes, defined as follows.

► **Definition 15** (Cellular Complex [17]). A **cellular complex**  $(X, \{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in P_X})$  is a topological space  $X$  partitioned in pieces  $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in P_X}$  called *cells*, where  $P_X$  is the indexing set. Each cell is homeomorphic to the  $n$ -disk  $D^n$ , for some  $n$ , such that:

1. Each point  $x \in X$  has a sufficiently small open neighborhood intersecting finitely many cells  $X_\alpha$ .
2. For any two cells  $X_\alpha, X_\beta$ ,  $Cl(X_\alpha) \cap X_\beta \neq \emptyset$  iff  $X_\beta \subseteq Cl(X_\alpha)$ , where  $Cl(X_\alpha)$  is the closure of  $X_\alpha$  in  $X$ .

When clear from context, the cellular complex is abbreviated as  $(X, P_X)$ .

The first condition makes the cellular complex locally finite, while the second one makes evident its partial order structure, where  $\beta \leq \alpha$  iff  $X_\beta \subseteq Cl(X_\alpha)$ . This means that the indexing set  $P_X$  has a poset structure. Additionally, a cellular complex  $X$  is **regular** if it can be recovered from the poset  $P_X$ , i.e., if there is a homeomorphism  $\varphi_\alpha : D^{d_\alpha} \rightarrow Cl(X_\alpha)$  mapping the interior of the  $d_\alpha$ -dimensional disk onto  $X_\alpha$ .

The concept of a **cellular category**[23] categorifies the cellular complex  $X$  by viewing its associated poset  $P_X$  as a category, which preserves the topological structure while enabling a categorical perspective better suited for defining sheaves.


► **Example 16** (Undirected Graph). An undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$ , with  $V$  a collection of vertices and  $E$  a collection of edges, gives rise to a cellular category  $\mathbf{Cell}(G)$ . Note that the data of an edge  $v_1 \xleftrightarrow{e} v_2$  consists of an unordered pair of vertices  $\{v_1, v_2\}$ , and the incidence relation of an edge to a vertex satisfies the inclusion  $v_1 \hookrightarrow \{v_1, v_2\} = e$ . With this in mind,  $\mathbf{Cell}(G)$  is obtained by constructing an object for each vertex  $v \in V$  and for each pair of vertices  $e \in E$ , with an arrow  $v \rightarrow e$  whenever  $v \hookrightarrow e$ . Objects obtained from vertices are called **0-cells** and those obtained from edges are called **1-cells**. This construction preserves the information of the graph, while adding a categorical structure.

Now we can make precise how a cellular sheaf describes exactly how to use a cellular category as the space to which data from another category is attached.

► **Definition 17** (Cellular Sheaf on a Cellular Complex[8]). A **cellular sheaf on a cellular complex**  $(X, P_X)$  is a functor  $\mathcal{F} : \mathbf{Cell}(P_X) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ , where  $\mathbf{Cell}(P_X)$  is the cellular category obtained from  $P_X$ . Explicitly, a cellular sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  is a function that assigns

- an object  $\mathcal{F}(\alpha) \in \mathbf{D}$  for each cell  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Cell}(P_X)$ , called the **stalk at  $\alpha$** ,

<sup>3</sup> See [8] for a thorough treatment of cellular sheaves, and [22] for an overview of sheaf theory.



■ **Figure 2** A set-valued sheaf over a cellular category.

- a family of morphisms  $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha \triangleleft \beta} : \mathcal{F}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\beta)$  for every pair of related cells  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$  in  $\mathbf{Cell}(P_X)$ , called the **restriction maps**.

Such that identities and composition of cellular maps are preserved.

We now define sections, which capture globally consistent assignments of data across the cellular complex. They are a fundamental concept in sheaf theory and will complete the language needed for our analysis of distributed task solvability.

► **Definition 18 (Section).** Let  $\mathcal{F} : \mathbf{Cell}(P_X) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  be a cellular sheaf over  $(X, P_X)$ . A **section** of  $\mathcal{F}$  is a choice of elements  $s = \{s_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Cell}(P_X)\}$  such that for every pair of cells with  $\alpha \triangleleft \beta$  the values coincide through restriction maps, i.e.,  $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha \triangleleft \beta}(s_\beta) = s_\alpha$ . The set of all global sections of  $\mathcal{F}$  is denoted by  $\Gamma(X, \mathcal{F})$ .

Intuitively, a section is a choice of values, one per cell, such that the same value is obtained if we restrict to a cell from each of its incident neighbors.

► **Remark 19 (Cellular Sheaves are Sheaves).** Note that the definition of sheaves, in full generality, requires an additional *sheaf condition*, which states how restriction maps and section interact. Every cellular sheaf obtained from Definition 17 satisfies the sheaf condition, as stated in Theorem 4.2.10 in [8]. This allows for the machinery of sheaf theory to be safely applied to cellular sheaves.

It is of our interest to make use of sheaves defined over graphs, which will be later specialized to carry the information of distributed tasks over an system execution graph. Example 20 shows an instance of a sheaf defined over a graph by assigning sets to each vertex and edge.

► **Example 20 (Sheaf Over a Graph).** In Figure 2 we depict a cellular category (i. e., an undirected graph) with objects representing the vertices  $\{V_1\}, \{V_2\}, \{V_3\}, \{V_4\}$ , objects representing edges  $\{V_1, V_2\}, \{V_1, V_3\}, \{V_2, V_3\}, \{V_3, V_4\}$  and morphisms as set inclusions. Each object is assigned data within the set of possible values  $\{x, y, z\}$ , i. e. its stalk. Stalks are the vertical bars associated to the vertices and edges, restriction maps are the curved arrows. We only explicitly depict the restriction maps from the objects  $V_1, V_2$  to the adjacent edge object  $\{V_1, V_2\}$  for brevity. For singleton sets we omit the brackets.

In a distributed system, configurations represent snapshots of the global state, while indistinguishability relations capture what each process can observe locally. The task specification defines which outputs are valid for given inputs. We introduce now the construction of a sheaf task, that connects those concepts and allows us to reason about task solvability.

Given a system frame  $\mathcal{K}$  that captures the uncertainty of the distributed system at hand and a task specification  $T$ , we now provide, through the language of sheaves, a concise object



that encodes the validity constraints which must be respected for the task  $T$  to be solved. This perspective allows for access to the tools and results developed within sheaf theory, including the sheaf cohomology that will be developed in Section 6.

► **Definition 21** (Task Sheaf). *Let  $T = \langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta \rangle$  be a task,  $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{E}$  a system frame generated by  $\mathcal{E}$ . The **task sheaf**  $\mathcal{F}_{T,\mathcal{K}}$  is a cellular sheaf defined as follows.*

1. (**stalks of configurations**) For each configuration  $\langle g \rangle \in A$ , the stalk is  $\mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}}(\langle g \rangle) = \Delta(\pi_I(\langle g \rangle))$ , i.e., the set of possible valid output configurations given the input assignments in  $\langle g \rangle$ .
2. (**stalks of relations**) For each indistinguishability edge  $(\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)_p \in \mathcal{R}_p$  between configurations  $\langle g \rangle$  and  $\langle h \rangle$  for process  $p$ , the stalk is  $\mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}}((\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)_p) = \{\pi_p(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}}(\langle g \rangle) \cup \mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}}(\langle h \rangle)\}$ , i.e., the set of possible values that process  $p$  can choose in either of the adjacent configurations.
3. (**restriction maps**) The restriction map from a configuration  $\langle g \rangle$  to an edge  $(\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)_p$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R},\langle g \rangle \sqsubseteq (\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)_p} = \pi_p$ , i.e., it projects an output configuration to its  $p$ 'th entry.

When  $A$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are clear from context, we simply write  $\mathcal{F}$  for  $\mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}}$ .

The vertices of  $\mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}}$  are configurations, while the edges in  $\mathcal{R}_p$  connect configurations where  $p$  should have the same decision value.

A section is a choice of data (i.e, output value) for each vertex (i.e, configuration) and each edge (i.e, indistinguishability relation) such that they all agree under the restriction maps.

► **Definition 22** (Sections). *A **section**  $S$  over a task sheaf is an element of the direct sum called the space of global sections  $\Gamma(\mathcal{F})$ :*

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{F}; G) = \left( \bigoplus_{v \in V(\mathcal{K})} \mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}}(v) \right) \times \left( \bigoplus_{e \in E(\mathcal{K})} \mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}}(e) \right).$$

written  $S(u)$  (resp.  $S(u, v)$ ) for its restriction to a configuration  $U$  (resp. edge  $u, v$ ), such that for any pair of vertices that share an edge  $(v, u)$ , the following holds:

$$S(e) = \mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R},v \sqsubseteq (v,u)}(S(v)) = \mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R},u \sqsubseteq (v,u)}(S(u)).$$

Intuitively, a section assigns a value to each vertex and each edge, such that the same value is obtained if we restrict to an edge from either of its vertices.

The space of sections over a sub-system-frame  $G' \subseteq G$  is denoted  $\Gamma(\mathcal{F}; G')$ .

A task sheaf for a task  $T$  can be equivalently understood process-wise, where for each process  $p_i \in \Pi$ , a sheaf  $\mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}_{p_i}} : \mathbf{Cell}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{CSet}_\Pi$  is defined. Whenever  $A$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are clear from the context, we will write  $\mathcal{F}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{F}_i$ ) instead of  $\mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{F}_{A,\mathcal{R}_{p_i}}$ ).  $\mathcal{F}_i$  has the following structure:

- $\mathbf{Cell}(A)$  is the cellular category obtained from the poset  $P_i$  induced by  $\mathcal{R}_{p_i}$  over  $A$ . Note that a pair of configurations  $(\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle) \in \sim_{p_i}$  induces the relations  $\langle g \rangle \sqsubseteq (\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)$  and  $\langle h \rangle \sqsubseteq (\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)$ .
- $\mathbf{CSet}_\Pi$  is the category of chromatic semi-simplicial sets, abbreviated as csets. They were introduced by Goubault et al. [14], and can be understood as sets of output values with enough structure to represent labeled configurations.

In this representation, configurations  $\langle g \rangle$  become 0-cells and equivalence edges become 1-cells. The sheaf  $\mathcal{F}_i$  maps a set of configurations to the set of  $n$ -simplices  $\Delta_n$  corresponding to its acceptable outputs, defined in the task specification  $T$ , and maps an inclusion of configurations  $\langle g \rangle \hookrightarrow (\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)$  to face maps  $\mathcal{F}_{\langle g \rangle \triangleleft (\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)} : \Delta_n \rightarrow \Delta_1$ , where a set of output decisions is sent to decisions process-wise, i.e. its  $p_i$  colored faces, such that the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \langle g \rangle & \longrightarrow & (\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle) & \longleftarrow & \langle h \rangle \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{F}_i(\langle g \rangle) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_i(\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle) & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{F}_i(\langle h \rangle)
 \end{array}$$

The sheaves defined for all agents  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{p_i \in \Pi}$  are a set of functors with common codomain.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \text{Cell}(K_1) & \text{Cell}(K_2) & \cdots & \text{Cell}(K_n) & & & \\
 \swarrow & \downarrow & \cdots & \searrow & & & \\
 & \mathcal{F}_1 & \mathcal{F}_2 & \mathcal{F}_n & & & \\
 & & \searrow & \swarrow & & & \\
 & & & \mathcal{CSet}_{\Pi} & & & 
 \end{array}$$

These form a subcategory of the category of cellular sheaves, where each object is a cellular sheaf  $\mathcal{F}_i : \mathbf{C}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$  and morphisms are commutative squares

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{C}_i & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{C}_j \\
 \mathcal{F}_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{F}_j \\
 \mathbf{D} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{D}
 \end{array}$$

where only all sheaves have a common codomain. The colimit of such cellular categories is well behaved and can be lifted for a colimit of cellular sheaves under those assumptions. The colimit of  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{p_i \in \Pi}$  then gives us a sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  that captures all of the information on the individual sheaves, where a global section exists iff there is a global section on the individual ones. The sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined over each configuration  $\langle g \rangle$  (resp. indistinguishability edge  $(\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)$ ) as the colimit of the individual sheaves localized at  $\langle g \rangle$  (resp.  $(\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)$ ). The sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  coincides with the explicit definition given in Definition 21.

## 5 Minimal Task Sheaves

► **Definition 23** (Execution Cut). *Let  $A \subset V(\mathcal{E})$  be a set of configurations. We say that  $A$  is an **execution cut** iff it is a cut set in  $\mathcal{E}$ , i.e., it intersects every run in  $\mathcal{E}$ .*

An execution cut represents a set of “unavoidable” configurations within the system. Furthermore, we say that an execution cut  $A \subset V(\mathcal{E})$  is **terminal** iff any  $U \in A$  is terminal, i.e., at configuration  $U$ , all processes must have decided.

► **Definition 24** (Local Star). *Let  $\langle g \rangle \in V(\mathcal{E})$  be a configuration,  $p \in \Pi$ , and  $N_p(\langle g \rangle) := \{\langle h \rangle \in V(\mathcal{E}) \mid \langle g \rangle \sim_p \langle h \rangle\}$ . That is,  $N_p(\langle g \rangle)$  is the equivalence class of  $\langle g \rangle$  under  $\sim_p$ . We define the **local star** of  $\langle g \rangle$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{N}(\langle g \rangle)$ , as the labeled graph obtained by  $\bigcup_{p \in \Pi} N_p(\langle g \rangle)$  and extend it over sets by  $\mathcal{N}(A) = \bigcup_{\langle g \rangle \in A} \mathcal{N}(\langle g \rangle)$*

► **Remark 25.** Note that for any  $p \in \Pi$ ,  $N_p(\langle g \rangle)$  induces a complete graph with all edges labeled by  $p$ .

► **Definition 26 (Causal Closure).** Let  $A$  be a terminal execution cut and  $\mathcal{N}(A)$  its local star. The causal closure  $ccl()$  contains all configurations that lie between  $\mathcal{N}(A)$  and  $A$ :

$$ccl(\mathcal{N}(A)) = \{\langle g \rangle \in A \mid \exists \langle h \rangle \in \mathcal{N}(A), \exists \langle w \rangle \in A, \langle h \rangle \leq \langle g \rangle \leq \langle w \rangle\}$$

► **Definition 27 (System Slice).** Let  $A \subset V(\mathcal{E})$  be an execution cut in the system frame  $\mathcal{K}$ , we define a **system slice**, denoted by  $ccl(\mathcal{N}(A))$  as the **causal closure** over the **local star** over  $A$ .

A system slice  $\mathcal{N}(A)$  of a terminal execution cut  $A$  **extends** to the partially terminated configurations in  $\mathcal{N}(A) \setminus A$ , where at least one process  $p$  has already terminated, but not necessarily all of them. Any partially terminated configuration  $\langle g \rangle$  eventually results into a terminated configuration  $\langle h \rangle$  in  $A$ . The causal closure contains all successors of partially terminated configurations up until they result in a fully terminated configuration in  $A$ . As some processes have already decided in a partially terminated configuration  $\langle g \rangle$ , we ensure that they keep their decided values in any successor configurations  $\langle h \rangle$  (reflecting that decisions are final) by constructing the **causal consistency**  $\{\simeq_{p_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$  relation such that  $\langle g \rangle \simeq_p \langle h \rangle$ .

► **Definition 28 (Causal Consistency Relation).** We define the **causal consistency** relation  $\{\simeq_{p_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$  as the symmetric closure of the binary relation composition  $\leq \circ \sim_{p_i}$ .


Intuitively, given a system slice  $ccl(\mathcal{N}(A))$ , the causal consistency relation relates all configurations where a process terminated in a **preceding** or **indistinguishable** configuration. As  $\leq$  and  $\{\sim_{p_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$  are reflexive,  $\{\simeq_{p_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$  is reflexive, and contains both relations  $\leq$  and  $\{\sim_{p_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$ . Observe that any causally dependent configurations in  $\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle \in A$  such that  $\langle g \rangle \leq \langle h \rangle$  are related  $\langle g \rangle \simeq \langle h \rangle$  (and also  $\langle h \rangle \simeq \langle g \rangle$ ) for all processes. Configurations  $\langle g \rangle$  in  $ccl(\mathcal{N}(A))$  that are not in  $A$ , are related to a configuration  $\langle h \rangle$  in  $A$  via the indistinguishability relation of  $p$  and any successor of  $\langle g \rangle$  is also related to  $\langle h \rangle$  for  $p$ . This ensures that the partially terminated process  $p$  keeps its terminated value.

In general system slices need not be finite, see Example 29 for an explicit construction of an execution graph with a necessarily infinite system slice.

► **Example 29.** In this example, we consider the tilted consensus task, where both processes have to decide on  $a$ 's value. The synchronous communication adversary here allows exactly one message from  $a$  to  $b$  per run, with no guarantee on when, so any communication adversary  $\mathcal{M}_r$  that satisfies  $\exists r : \mathcal{M}_r^{a \leftarrow b} = \perp \wedge \mathcal{M}_r^{b \leftarrow a} \neq \perp \forall r' \neq r \mathcal{M}_r = (\perp, \perp)$ . We again represent this via arrows, where  $-$  denotes that no message is delivered, as follows  $\psi = -* \rightarrow -^\omega$ , depicted in Figure 3.  $a$ 's indistinguishability relations between configurations are again orange,  $b$ 's are green.

Clearly,  $b$  just waits until something arrives, whereas  $a$  can terminate immediately. As  $b$  cannot distinguish whether it will end up in the 0 or 1 deciding half until it receives that message (i.e.  $b$  doesn't know  $a$ 's value), no configuration  $U$  where no message has arrived yet can be terminal. At the same time, every configuration  $U$  is partially terminated as it is indistinguishable for  $a$  from a terminal configuration (marked in the dashed terminal regions). The smallest system slice therefore has infinite size in this execution graph.

► **Theorem 30 (Terminating Task Solvability).** Let  $T = \langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{O}, \Delta \rangle$  be a task, and  $\mathcal{P}$  a protocol: there exists a **terminating decision map**  $\delta$  solving  $T$  iff there exists a **execution cut**  $A$



■ **Figure 3** Depiction of the tilted consensus task, the configurations in neither dashed box are partially terminated. The yellow colored global states are partially terminated states, the dashed red and green edges represent some of the causal consistency relation as most transitive edges are omitted favoring readability. This system frame grows upwards.

such that its system slice,  $ccl(\mathcal{N}(A))$ , together with its causal consistency relation  $\{\simeq_{p_i}\}_{i \in [n]}$ , has a section over the task sheaf  $\mathcal{F}_{A, \simeq}$ .

**Proof.** Let us assume first that  $\delta$ , solves  $T$ . Therefore, for any run  $\rho$ , there exists a configuration  $\langle g \rangle_\rho$  that is the earliest configuration of  $\rho$  where each process has decided  $\delta(\langle g \rangle) \neq \perp$ . Note that  $A = \{\langle g \rangle_\rho \mid \rho \text{ is a run of } \mathcal{P}\}$  is a system cut.

Consider the system slice  $ccl(\mathcal{N}(A))$ . By assumption  $\delta_p$  assigns a  $T$  solving, non- $\perp$  value to every configuration  $\langle g \rangle \in ccl(\mathcal{N}(A))$ , and satisfies Item 1, Item 3 and Item 2 making  $\mathcal{F}_{A, \simeq}$  a sheaf. The sheaf condition in Definition 22 is satisfied as decisions are final, i.e., any successor configuration of a terminated configuration has the same decision, and  $\delta_p$  is a function on local states, i.e., configurations  $p$  cannot distinguish are mapped identically by  $\delta_p$ .

Now to prove the converse, assume that there exists an execution cut  $A$  such that its system slice,  $ccl(\mathcal{N}(A))$ , has a section  $S$ . We construct a terminating decision map by setting

$$\delta_p(\pi_p(\langle g \rangle)) = \begin{cases} S(\phi(A, \langle h \rangle)) & \text{for any } \langle h \rangle \text{ where } \pi_p(\langle h \rangle) = \pi_p(\langle g \rangle) \text{ and } \langle h \rangle \in A \\ \perp & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly  $\delta_p$  terminates because  $A$  is an execution cut and satisfies Definition 8.  $\delta_p$  solves  $T$  because first, the only vectors in the stalks over the configurations are task solving vectors. And second,  $\delta_p$  is well-behaved and maps identical inputs to identical outputs by Item 3 and the sheaf condition in Definition 22, i.e., per-processes outputs need to agree over indistinguishable configurations. ◀

Now that we have characterized solvability of a task  $T$  under a protocol  $\mathcal{P}$  in terms of its task sheaf,  $\mathcal{F}_{A, \simeq}$ , we will also establish a relation between local cohomology of the task sheaf and the task solvability.

## 6 Computing Solutions

Given a communication adversary  $K$  representing some adversarial entity together with a task  $T$ , we search for a protocol together with a decision map. As the full-information protocol provides the finest possible execution tree, its natural to start the search process there. Slices that are finite in size can be recursively enumerated and, although that's computationally inefficient, tested. If we find a finite slice  $A$  that allows for a terminal decision map we can try to optimize the protocol inducing the execution tree. If we do not find a slice, but keep looking forever, then a finite slice does not exist and the task is not wait-free solvable, although it might be solvable given an **infinite slice**.

In this section we focus on wait-free solvability, so assume we have found a finite terminating slice  $ccl(\mathcal{N}(A))$ , we computationally determine the space of all sections and therefore the decision map  $\delta$ . We do this via *cohomology*, i.e., we turn our structure into an abelian group and extract from it all possible solutions.

Given a task sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$ , the process of obtaining the  $n$ th sheaf cohomology can be understood as an iteration of the following steps.

$$H^n(\mathcal{F}) : \mathbf{Cell}(X) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{CSet}_\Pi \xrightarrow{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{sAb} \xrightarrow{\delta^n} \mathbf{Ch}_\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{H^n} \mathbf{Ab}$$

Where  $\mathbf{sAb}$  is the category of simplicial abelian groups,  $\mathbf{Ch}_\mathbb{Z}$  is the category of (co)chain complexes with integer coefficients and  $\mathbf{Ab}$  the category of Abelian groups, where our cohomology lives.

We provide a brief explanation, and illustrate it below in Example 34. Given a cset  $\mathcal{O}$  containing the possible system output states, we can obtain a simplicial abelian group through the left adjoint of the forgetful functor that sends it to the underlying simplicial set<sup>4</sup>. The third map gets us a cochain complex with differentials defined from the alternating sum of the (co)face maps. Finally, we obtain the  $n$ -th cohomology group, which corresponds to a space of sections of our sheaf. This construction is well known in the literature of algebraic topology [17] and we adapt it as a tool for understanding distributed tasks.

► **Definition 31** (Space of Zero- and One- Cochains). *Resembling Definition 22, we define*

$$C^0(\mathcal{K}; \mathcal{F}) = \bigoplus_{v \in V(\mathcal{K})} \mathcal{F}(v)$$

as the space of **zero cochains** of the sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$ , i.e., the vector space of all possible assignments to vertices (configurations) in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Similarly

$$C^1(\mathcal{K}; \mathcal{F}) = \bigoplus_{e_{p_i} \in E(\mathcal{K})} \mathcal{F}(e_{p_i})$$

is the space one **one cochains**, i.e., the space over possible output choices for processors.

The two cochain groups are connected via a linear coboundary map  $\delta$ . This maps a specific choice of output vectors to the individual choices along the indistinguishability edges defined by the restriction maps. To define  $\delta$  we chose an arbitrary direction on each indistinguishability edge  $e = \langle g \rangle \rightarrow \langle h \rangle$  just to facilitate an algebraic representation.

<sup>4</sup> Here chromatic semi-simplicial sets are treated as simplicial sets for simplicity, as they only add the process labeling that would require extra bookkeeping.

► **Definition 32** (Coboundary Map). We denote by  $d : C^0 \mapsto C^1$  the coboundary map, defined per edge  $e = (\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)_{p_i}$  in the sheaf as:

$$d(x)_{e_{p_i} = (\langle g \rangle, \langle h \rangle)_{p_i}} = \pi_{p_i}(x_{\langle h \rangle}) - \pi_{p_i}(x_{\langle g \rangle}),$$

where we assume that the chosen direction goes from  $\langle g \rangle \rightarrow \langle h \rangle$ .


We can represent the coboundary map  $d$  as a coboundary matrix  $D$  where rows are indexed by edges and columns are indexed by configurations:

$$D_{\langle g \rangle, e = (\langle h \rangle, \langle h \rangle')_{p_j}} = \begin{cases} d(e) & \text{if } \langle h \rangle = \langle g \rangle \text{ or } \langle h \rangle' = \langle g \rangle \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

One can think of  $D$  simply as computing the difference between two indistinguishable configurations. A section on our sheaf is a 0-cochain that is mapped to 0 by  $d$ , so any assignment to configurations such that any process that cannot distinguish two configurations, decides the same thing. The set of all sections is then the kernel  $\ker(D)$ .

► **Definition 33** (Zeroth Cohomology). The zero-th cohomology is  $\ker(D)$ , i. e., the kernel of the coboundary map.

► **Example 34.** Let us consider the approximate agreement problem for 2 processes in the lossy link synchronous message adversary setting, illustrated in Figure 4. We are interested in whether given a full information protocol, the induced system execution graph allows for a terminal execution cut, such that by Theorem 30 we can find a section that gives us a decision map.



■ **Figure 4** An example of the approximate agreement task (with  $\varepsilon = 0.25$ ) in the lossy-link synchronous communication adversary Definition 4.

We set the possible input vectors to  $I = \{ \binom{0}{0}, \binom{1}{0}, \binom{0}{1}, \binom{1}{1} \}$ , the possible output vectors to  $O = \{ \binom{x}{y} \mid x, y \in \{0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1\} \}$  and define the validity map as

$$\Delta\left(\binom{x}{y}\right) = \begin{cases} \binom{0}{0} & \text{when } x = y = 0 \\ \binom{1}{1} & \text{when } x = y = 1 \\ O & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Intuitively, in the initial configuration we cannot find a section, since both configurations,  $(0, 0)$  and  $(1, 1)$ , force the respective connecting configurations  $(0, 1)$  and  $(1, 0)$  to choose an output vector that projects to 1 and 0, which does not exist in  $O$ . We can formalize this impossibility starting with the co-boundary matrix  $D^0$  (for the execution graph visualized in Figure 4), where we number the configurations by the initial values interpreted in binary, and edges are just tuples of configurations, with the direction following the written order.

$$D^0 = \begin{pmatrix} & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 01 & -\pi_a & \pi_a & & \\ 13 & & -\pi_b & & \pi_b \\ 32 & & & \pi_a & -\pi_a \\ 20 & \pi_b & & \pi_b & \end{pmatrix}$$

In order to find the kernel of  $D^0$ , we can assume some arbitrary assignment vector to the configurations  $x = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}, x_1, x_2, \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)^T$  (as the configurations 1 and 3 have only one possible choice by validity) and solve  $D^0 x = 0$ :

$$D^0 x = \begin{pmatrix} -0^a + x_1^a \\ -x_1^b + 1^b \\ x_2^a - 1^a \\ 0^b - x_2^b \end{pmatrix} \implies \begin{matrix} x_1^a = 0^a, \\ x_1^b = 1^b, \\ x_2^a = 1^a, \\ x_2^b = 0^b \end{matrix} \implies x_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } x_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This proves that epsilon agreement is impossible in 0 steps as the required solutions  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are not possible solutions, the kernel is trivial. The impossibility itself does not come as a surprise. The novelty lies in the fact that that every step we took was purely deterministic and computable, meaning that such operations could have been done by a program.

After one step of communication,  $(0, 0 \rightarrow)$  forces  $(0, 1 \rightarrow)$  to choose an output that matches  $a$ 's decision, lets say  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ .25 \end{pmatrix}$ . This forces  $b$ 's decision in  $(0, 1 \leftrightarrow)$  to be  $.25$  a valid output could be  $\begin{pmatrix} .25 \\ .5 \end{pmatrix}$ . Again, this forces  $a$ 's hand in  $(0, 1 \leftarrow)$  to  $.5$ , we could choose  $\begin{pmatrix} .5 \\ .75 \end{pmatrix}$  here. But now we run into a problem, (indicated by the purple dashed arrow), in configuration  $(1, 1 \leftarrow)$  we cannot find an output vector that maps  $b$ 's value to  $.75$ ! Therefore this assignment is not a section!

Note that this example is not a proof that one cannot solve approximate agreement after one step, and is only meant to illustrate the role of cohomology in determining task solvability, as the coboundary matrix after one step is already huge. But, as already illustrated, any step here is deterministic and computable, therefore we can find a section after two steps, implying the existence of a protocol solving epsilon agreement.

We formalize this intuition in Proposition 35.

► **Proposition 35** (Computable Decision Maps). *Let  $T$  be a task that can be solved in a finite system slice (i. e. finitely many terminal configurations) in a given execution graph  $\mathcal{E}$ , then its decision map is computable in finite time.*

The idea is simple: compute the execution graph  $\mathcal{E}$  layer by layer and check whether any system slice admits a non-trivial zeroth cohomology.

**Proof.** Assume the task  $T$  can be solved in a finite system slice. We can iteratively build up the tree  $\mathcal{E}(k)$ <sup>5</sup>, up to some  $k$ . For each  $k$ , chose any possible  $A$  and corresponding system

<sup>5</sup> As any configuration has at most finitely directly causally dependent configurations, i. e., children in the execution graph, we can label any node by its depth. Then we iteratively build the tree up to depth  $n$ .

slice  $\mathcal{N}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$  and compute its zeroth cohomology. If it admits a non-trivial kernel on  $\mathcal{N}(A)$ , then derive a protocol as described in ??.

By assumption such a  $\mathcal{N}(A)$  exists. By building the tree iteratively, eventually this  $A$  will be found and the iterations terminates. ◀

## 7 Conclusions

Our results, and in particular, our task sheaf construction, constitutes to the best of our knowledge, the first sheaf-theoretic characterization of general distributed computing tasks. Moreover, the generality of our model allows us to describe a wide range of systems that only need to satisfy minimal assumptions, namely, that the set of processes is finite, and that the communication is produced via messages.

Furthermore, by expressing tasks as a sheaf we are able to incorporate cohomology theory as a powerful tool for distributed systems. For instance, the cohomology of a task sheaf is a group that represents the “obstructions” or “limitations” in the distributed system that prevent a specific task to be solved. One of many potential advantages of using cohomology is already made explicit through an example, where we show an impossibility result by simply looking at the cohomology group of its task sheaf. Note, however, that the cohomology of a task sheaf is not restricted to only determining impossibilities, but it may also be used for finding a protocol.

Finally, the rigorous categorical foundation of our approach provides a solid starting point for further research, such as incorporating failure models and alternative termination conditions for cooperative termination.

## Related Version

A short paper version of this paper will be presented at The 32nd International Colloquium On Structural Information and Communication Complexity (SIROCCO 2025).

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our advisors Eric Goubault and Ulrich Schmid for the inspiring discussions and their invaluable input.

We would also like to extend our thanks to the SIROCCO’25 reviewers for their much valued feedback, which undoubtedly improved this paper.

---

## References

- 1 Samson Abramsky and Adam Brandenburger. The sheaf-theoretic structure of non-locality and contextuality. *New Journal of Physics*, 13(11):113036, 2011. doi:10.1088/1367-2630/13/11/113036.
- 2 E. A. Akkoyunlu, K. Ekanadham, and R. V. Huber. Some constraints and tradeoffs in the design of network communications. In *SOSP ’75: Proceedings of the fifth ACM symposium on Operating systems principles*, pages 67–74, New York, NY, USA, 1975. ACM. doi:http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/800213.806523.
- 3 Manuel Alcántara, Armando Castañeda, David Flores-Peñaloza, and Sergio Rajsbaum. The topology of look-compute-move robot wait-free algorithms with hard termination. *Distrib. Comput.*, 32(3):235–255, June 2019. doi:10.1007/s00446-018-0345-3.



- 4 Hagit Attiya, Armando Castañeda, and Thomas Nowak. Topological Characterization of Task Solvability in General Models of Computation. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.13837>, arXiv:2301.13837.
- 5 C. Battiloro, Z. Wang, H. Riess, P. Di Lorenzo, and A. Ribeiro. Tangent Bundle Filters and Neural Networks: From Manifolds to Cellular Sheaves and Back. In *ICASSP 2023 - 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5, 2023. doi:10.1109/ICASSP49357.2023.10096934.
- 6 Michael Ben-Or and Nathan Linial. Collective coin flipping, robust voting schemes and minima of banzhaf values. In *26th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1985)*, pages 408–416, 1985. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1985.15.
- 7 Cristian Bodnar, Francesco Di Giovanni, Benjamin Paul Chamberlain, Pietro Liò, and Michael M. Bronstein. Neural Sheaf Diffusion: A Topological Perspective on Heterophily and Oversmoothing in GNNs. arXiv:2202.04579, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2202.04579.
- 8 Justin M Curry. Sheaves, cosheaves and applications.
- 9 Ronald Fagin, Joseph Y. Halpern, Yoram Moses, and Moshe Y. Vardi. *Reasoning About Knowledge*. MIT Press, 1995. doi:10.7551/mitpress/5803.001.0001.
- 10 Faith E. Fich and Eric Ruppert. Hundreds of impossibility results for distributed computing. *Distributed Comput.*, 16(2-3):121–163, 2003. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-003-0091-y>, doi:10.1007/S00446-003-0091-Y.
- 11 Michael J. Fischer, Nancy A. Lynch, and Michael S. Paterson. Impossibility of distributed consensus with one faulty process. *J. ACM*, 32(2):374–382, April 1985. doi:10.1145/3149.214121.
- 12 Robert Ghrist and Hans Riess. Cellular sheaves of lattices and the Tarski Laplacian. 24(1):325–345, 2022. doi:10.4310/HHA.2022.v24.n1.a16.
- 13 Joseph A. Goguen. Sheaf semantics for concurrent interacting objects. 2(2):159–191. doi:10.1017/S0960129500001420.
- 14 Éric Goubault, Roman Kniazev, Jérémy Ledent, and Sergio Rajsbaum. Semi-Simplicial Set Models for Distributed Knowledge. pages 1–13. doi:10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175737.
- 15 Joseph Y. Halpern and Yoram Moses. Knowledge and common knowledge in a distributed environment. *J. ACM*, 37(3):549–587, 1990. doi:http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/79147.79161.
- 16 Jakob Hansen and Robert Ghrist. Toward a spectral theory of cellular sheaves. 3(4):315–358. doi:10.1007/s41468-019-00038-7.
- 17 Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic topology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- 18 Maurice Herlihy and Nir Shavit. The asynchronous computability theorem for t-resilient tasks. In *STOC '93: Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 111–120, New York, NY, USA, 1993. ACM. doi:http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/167088.167125.
- 19 Cliff A. Joslyn, Lauren Charles, Chris DePerno, Nicholas Gould, Kathleen Nowak, Brenda Praggastis, Emilie Purvine, Michael Robinson, Jennifer Strules, and Paul Whitney. A Sheaf Theoretical Approach to Uncertainty Quantification of Heterogeneous Geolocation Information. 20(12):3418. doi:10.3390/s20123418.
- 20 Kohei Kishida. Public Announcements under Sheaves. In Yoichi Motomura, Alastair Butler, and Daisuke Bekki, editors, *New Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, volume 7856, pages 96–108. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-39931-2\_8.
- 21 Kohei Kishida. Neighborhood-Sheaf Semantics for First-Order Modal Logic. 278:129–143, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.entcs.2011.10.011.
- 22 Saunders Mac Lane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic: A First Introduction to Topos Theory*. Universitext. Springer New York. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-0927-0.
- 23 M. Makkai and J. Rosický. Cellular categories. 218(9):1652–1664. doi:10.1016/j.jpaa.2014.01.005.
- 24 Grant Malcolm. Sheaves, Objects, and Distributed Systems. 225:3–19. doi:10.1016/j.entcs.2008.12.063.

- 25 Seyed Mansourbeigi. Sheaf Theory Approach to Distributed Applications: Analysing Heterogeneous Data in Air Traffic Monitoring. *International Journal of Data Science and Analysis*, 3(5):34–39, 2017. doi:10.11648/j.ijdsa.20170305.11.
- 26 Thomas Nowak, Ulrich Schmid, and Kyrill Winkler. Topological characterization of consensus in distributed systems: Dedicated to the 2018 dijkstra prize winners bowen alpern and fred b. schneider. *J. ACM*, August 2024. Just Accepted. doi:10.1145/3687302.
- 27 Hans Riess and Robert Ghrist. Diffusion of Information on Networked Lattices by Gossip. In *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5946–5952, 2022. doi:10.1109/CDC51059.2022.9992539.
- 28 Michael Robinson. Sheaves are the canonical data structure for sensor integration. *Information Fusion*, 36:208–224, 2017. doi:10.1016/j.inffus.2016.12.002.
- 29 Nicola Santoro and Peter Widmayer. Time is not a healer. In *Proc. 6th Annual Symposium on Theor. Aspects of Computer Science (STACS'89)*, LNCS 349, pages 304–313, Paderborn, Germany, February 1989. Springer-Verlag.